


CODIB-D-114  
12 October 1965  
Limited Distribution

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Draft CODIB Annual Report  
FY 1965

Attached for telephone concurrence by Wednesday, 20 October is the draft narrative; the departmental contributions now have been received and will constitute Appendix C without change except for formatting. Naturally, if desired, a meeting can be scheduled to discuss this draft.

  
Secretary

S-E-C-R-E-T

GROUP I  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

D

S-E-C-R-E-T

R

A

F

T

CODIB-AR-7  
12 October 1965

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Seventh Annual Report

Authorization

The USIB Committee on Documentation (CODIB) operates under DCID 1/4  
(New Series) dated 26 June 1959.

Scope

This report covers CODIB activities during Fiscal Year 1965, with an attached checklist (Appendix A) of documents issued; membership during the reporting period is reflected in Appendix B. New developments in information processing in individual member agencies are reflected in Appendix C.

Activities

The main concern during the reporting period was the progress of nine task teams, established after USIB review of the Staff for the Community Information Processing Study (SCIPS); team activities have been reported to USIB quarterly (the latest report distributed as USIB-D-39.7/10, 14 September 1965). The teams held 114 meetings and expended about 20,000 professional man-hours - or about 10 1/2 man years, including the four professionals on full-time assignment on the CODIB Support Staff. A total of 245 substantive team papers and about 100

S-E-C-R-E-T

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 2 -

additional working papers were generated. Formal CODIB review of the task teams' progress and consideration of other matters of interest resulted in eight meetings and the issuance of 41 staff papers, of which 35 dealt with the team activities.

The Committee's other extant bodies include the Subcommittee on Classification (SCC), a Working Group on Emergency Planning (WGEP) and a Working Group on Remote Systems Input (WGRSI). The SCC did not meet as a body, but individual members met to work up a forthcoming revision to the Intelligence Subject Code and to discuss a proposal that the DoD area code be adopted as a Community standard (see page 5 below). The WGEP began a revision of its basic document on dispersal of finished intelligence collections. The WGRSI held three formal meetings to review the status of the development of the secure, machine-language by-product typewriter; indicators of difficulty noted during the year multiplied until, after the close of this reporting period, some fairly severe problems had developed. Basically, the contractor development was not monitored closely enough by the executive agency. Appropriate corrective steps are now being studied.

#### Membership

Several changes occurred during the reporting period: Lt. Col. F. R. Case was designated Army representative vice Lt. Col. William W. Higgins; Cdr. Alfred R. Olsen, Jr. was named for Navy vice Capt. Donald F. Seaman; Lt. Col (subsequently, Col.) Byron L. Schatzley succeeded Col. Kevork Ghourdjian as Air Force member; Messrs. A. Sidney Buford, III and Curtis L. Firtz succeeded

- 3 -

Messrs. Edward C. Wilson and Benjamin H. Fisher as State member and alternate, respectively; and Mr. Earl W. McCoy was named FBI alternate vice Mr. Norman F. Stultz.

#### CODIB Support Staff

The previous report noted preliminary planning for a permanent Secretariat; such was established and includes Messrs. [REDACTED]

25X1A

[REDACTED] of DIA, both former SCIPS team members, and Messrs. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] of CIA. During the year they concentrated on the task team activities, the largest amount of their time going to recording and administrative duties for individual teams, with limited time available for philosophic or actual synthesizing among team activities.

#### The Task Team Approach

Looking back over the last five or six years, one notes the same basic themes as those heard today: compatibility, standardization, remote communication links, biographic information exchange, and the proper use of automatic data processing equipment. The principal difference is that, today, nearly everyone has some degree of awareness that information processing (or information data handling [IDH], as our R&D Task Team report calls it) is both a significant part of the intelligence cycle and a major problem area. CODIB's early catalytic efforts were hampered by (a) lack of recognition and support as significant problem-solving efforts; (b) competition between Community efforts and developing Departmental systems for scarce in-house manpower; and (c) the usual difficulties in attempting change via committee.

- 4 -

The present task team activity stems from USIB action on the Staff for the Community-Information Processing Study (SCIPS); it reflects increased awareness of the need for greater management control in the IDH field and some feel for the probable gain from common problem definitions and selected compatibility and standardization steps. It also reflects accommodation to the hard core real world in the more nebulous Community atmosphere, where manpower resources remain scarce; part-time participation in ad hoc committees is not thought by most to be as costly as full-time commitments to a Community staff. And with the advent of the U & S Command structure and increased inter-service activities, positive results have come from committee approaches to problem-solving - albeit within a single (DoD) management line.

As noted above, the CODIB Support Staff consists of four professionals who devote full-time to task team monitoring; the manpower expenditure for nine task teams during the past year exceeded 10 manyears. A considerable part of the year went to developing the terms of reference for each team and getting team members briefed on existing Community practices. Team reports are either not yet in, or have so recently been received that CODIB action on them is not complete. When they are all in, it would be appropriate to consider the relative merits of continuing in the present task team manner; expanding the Staff to substitute for task team fact-gathering and report-drafting; or assigning executive agency responsibility for solution of a given problem.

- 5 -

### Pressures from Groups Outside of the Community

Awareness of the "information explosion" problem and of the need for informed management policies concerning ADP equipment is by no means confined to the Intelligence Community. Much is being said about it in the commercial literature, in Congressional committees, in the Bureau of the Budget, in the scientific and technical (governmental and academic) community and, most recently, in the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. New computer hardware developments, including larger memories and multi-processing capabilities, have led to greater emphasis on centralization of computer equipment as, allegedly, the best guarantee of a good cost/effectiveness ratio (although it looks now as if hardware manufacturers' claims concerning "third generation" computers were premature); also the rise in numbers of computers in the Government as a whole has led the BoB and the DoD to increase the pace of ADP standardization.

CODIB's historic message concerning the role of IDH is, to some degree, boomeranging, and liaison with and responses to outside groups will undoubtedly occupy much CODIB attention during FY 1966. For example, BoB, with good intent and with an eye to economy in ADP, is actively leading Government agencies toward standardization, without necessarily being aware of the impact of their efforts, particularly on existing large-scale automated or semi-automated systems. A case in point is the geo-political area code working group established by the BoB during this reporting period to facilitate exchange of information among agencies and to overcome their alleged tendency to think only in parochial terms.

- 6 -

25X1A

[REDACTED] of the CODIB Support Staff and Mr. Fritz of State (former Director, SCIPS) sit with this group; because of their experience, they were able to influence the Group's direction to keep it in the real world. Their original intent was to settle on a code for standardized computer processing, before they had considered whether they had common agreement on the items to be coded -- there is not, yet, agreement among our Government agencies on the names or geopolitical affiliations of all of the world's countries, islands, bodies of water, etc. Within the Intelligence Community we have acquired experience, both individual and communal, in this small but important facet, and there exists an area code which has been issued as the USIB-Community standard; its current usability or revision was studied by the Content Control Task Team and will be noted in their report - catalytic action here by BoB was not required, particularly when it was not informed action.

The BoB area code approach reflects another aspect of the problem. Their first inclination was to standardize on a two-digit DoD area code since it had recently been promulgated as the standard for all DoD complexes (including intelligence), the USIB-Community code notwithstanding. DoD is big and has big money in computers and computer-backed systems; it is logical for BoB to look at expansion of DoD standards to other agencies as the most economic route. But, (a) non-intelligence DoD standards do not necessarily meet Intelligence Community requirements, and (b) certain DoD intelligence standards, reflecting current policy regarding links between DIA and the Theater Commands, are not

- 7 -

necessarily the answer for CIA, or others; nor have they yet proved themselves within the DoD intelligence community.

The Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI), in support of White House S&T policy, is establishing certain standards for Government agencies in information handling and information exchange. These impact directly on DoD, NASA, AEC and others - and can, probably will, impact on the Intelligence Community. And, most recently, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board has obtained Presidential approval for steps toward a more effective information exchange network.

#### Philosophic Approach

Concentration, too early, on standardization among the USIB-member departments and agencies will be counterproductive; identification of the basic problems for development now of compatibility steps in system design will be most beneficial. Given the present state of the art plus existing and modifiable R&D efforts, we believe that a three-phase approach ought to be endorsed by the USIB: (1) attention (and management support) to improving the individual systems in each USIB agency, with projected compatibility monitored by CODIB and the PFIAB Panel on Information Handling; (2) improved communication between systems within an agency (NPIC - CHIVE; CHIVE - Walnut, etc.); and (3) development of a Community-wide information network. Certain compressions or accelerations can occur, and some have already occurred (e.g. the Long Distance Xerography [LDX] network and certain format, coding or descriptive standards now agreed to).



- 8 -

It is probably true that managers of the existing large-scale systems in operation in the Intelligence Community today are as good as any to be found elsewhere, and the problems of living in a big line production environment, keeping antennae out for state-of-the-art or procedural improvements, are significant enough in themselves without involvement in larger problems such as Community networks. A proper blend of line operations, R&D and planning is essential, and the proper allocation of resources (manpower and money) to the line operations to allow experienced people to move into design without destroying the heart of the operations is perhaps the key to successful Community planning.

A further point: just as the world has moved and is moving in large measure from the synoptic knowledge of metaphysics through specialization to increasing cross-disciplinary awareness, CODIB, and information processing, is increasingly concerned with others' activities and is not confinable within easily identified boundaries. Format considerations for input to computer files or microstorage leads to direct interest in COMOR and SIGINT Committee collection in addition to the traditional interest in human source reporting. All-source design efforts have major security considerations which require USIB Security Committee and COMOR/SIGINT Committee discussion. The CODIB Task Team on Research & Development comes very close to, and has stimulated concern from, the R&D complexes within DIA, NSA and CIA. The scientific interests of COSATI,

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 9 -

particularly as it includes DoD membership, affects system design within the USIB Community. In line with a new look at management and coordination of the developing information systems, it may well be advisable to revise DCID 1/4, under which CODIB operates.

CODIB Fiscal Year 1966 Program

Without doubt, CODIB will devote most of its attention during FY 66 to the task team reports and the management and procedural implications of their recommendations. In addition, considerable effort will be devoted to implementation of the PFIAB recommendations approved by the President and assigned to CODIB for action after the close of this reporting period. Finally, and as noted, questions concerning the proper interface of the central reference functions and the ADP processing activities, including liaison with non-USIB committees and the BoB, will require increased attention. It promises to be a busy year.

Paul A. Borel  
Chairman